

CCRB INVESTIGATIVE RECOMMENDATION

Investigator: Olga Bentin	Team: Squad #4	CCRB Case #: 201801168	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Force	<input type="checkbox"/> Discourt.	<input type="checkbox"/> U.S.
			<input type="checkbox"/> Abuse	<input type="checkbox"/> O.L.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Injury
Incident Date(s) Thursday, 11/02/2017 2:55 AM	Location of Incident: § 87(2)(b)	Precinct: 67	18 Mo. SOL 5/2/2019	EO SOL 5/2/2019	
Date/Time CV Reported Thu, 11/02/2017 4:49 AM	CV Reported At: IAB	How CV Reported: Phone	Date/Time Received at CCRB Mon, 02/12/2018 11:14 AM		

Complainant/Victim	Type	Home Address
§ 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)

Subject Officer(s)	Shield	TaxID	Command
1. POM Sean Regan	18457	955367	067 PCT
2. POM Gregory Vasquez	21626	951369	067 PCT
3. POM Michael Becker	117	954892	067 PCT

Witness Officer(s)	Shield No	Tax No	Cmd Name
1. POM Jason Ciota	01410	951615	067 PCT

Officer(s)	Allegation	Investigator Recommendation
A.POM Gregory Vasquez	Force: Police Officer Gregory Vasquez used physical force against § 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)
B.POM Michael Becker	Force: Police Officer Michael Becker used physical force against § 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)
C.POM Sean Regan	Force: Police Officer Sean Regan used physical force against § 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)

Case Summary

On November 2, 2017, Sgt. Michael Scally of the 67th Precinct contacted the IAB Command Center by phone and filed this complaint on behalf of a prisoner, § 87(2)(b). On February 12, 2018, this complaint was received at the CCRB. The initial IAB complaint only listed § 87(2)(b)'s name.

On February 13, 2018, a BADS search of § 87(2)(b)'s arrest report stemming from this incident listed his address, but no telephone number. Further search of § 87(2)(b)'s arrest records for 2017 revealed two telephone numbers. On February 13, 2018, a call was placed to one of two numbers obtained during the BADS search, but it was disconnected.

On February 13, 2018, a call was placed to the second telephone number obtained during the BADS search in an effort to get in contact with § 87(2)(b)'s mother, § 87(2)(b). § 87(2)(b) said that § 87(2)(b) was not at home. § 87(2)(b) did not know § 87(2)(b)'s telephone number, but provided his mailing address. § 87(2)(b) was then asked if she would be willing to provide § 87(2)(b) with the CCRB's contact information, and she agreed. On February 15, 2018, a second call was placed to § 87(2)(b) to find out if she had a chance to speak to § 87(2)(b). § 87(2)(b) said that she provided § 87(2)(b) with the CCRB's contact information and asked him to contact the agency.

On February 13, 2018, a LEXIS search for § 87(2)(b) did not list any telephone numbers, but revealed one additional address.

On February 20, 2018, a CLEAR search for § 87(2)(b) confirmed LEXIS search results and revealed three additional telephone numbers. Between February 20, 2018, and February 26, 2018, three calls were made to two of three numbers obtained during the CLEAR search. Each time a voice message was left for § 87(2)(b) requesting a call back.

On February 20, 2018, a call was placed to the third telephone number, and a voice message was left for § 87(2)(b) requesting that he contact the CCRB. On February 22, 2018, a second call was placed to § 87(2)(b) to this number. § 87(2)(b) replied, said that he was busy at work, and promised to call back. On February 26, 2018, a third call was placed to § 87(2)(b). § 87(2)(b) confirmed his contact information, refused to provide an email, but agreed to receive text message notifications from the agency. § 87(2)(b) refused to provide any statements to the CCRB while his criminal case is ongoing. § 87(2)(b) was explained that his complaint would be closed, but that he could request that it be reopened after his criminal case is resolved. § 87(2)(b) agreed.

A request for BWC footage returned negative results.

Between February 13, 2018, and February 20, 2018, a total of five letters were mailed to § 87(2)(b) to the addresses obtained during the LEXIS, BADS, and CLEAR searches, and to the address provided to the investigation by § 87(2)(b) which was also confirmed by § 87(2)(b). None of the letter mailed to § 87(2)(b) were returned by USPS as undelivered.

§ 87(2)(g)

